

SUPPORT COST BY FUNCTIONAL ACTIVITY

PEER REVIEW TEAM ANNUAL KICKOFF MEETING

MINUTES OF MEETING

The Support Cost by Functional Activity Peer Review Team met for its Annual Kickoff Meeting at Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, Berkeley, California, on January 12-13, 2004. In attendance were the following Team members:

David G. Keller – Savannah River Site – Team Lead
Gregg W. Landon – Idaho National Engineering and Environmental Laboratory
Armando R. Bautista – Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory
Cindy W. Doyle – Pacific Northwest National Laboratory
William C. Hudson, Jr. – BWXT Y-12
Antoinette Russo – Brookhaven National Laboratory
Chris Brannan – Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory

The Team member from West Valley Nuclear Services Company was unable to attend, due to workload at his site.

I. The Meeting began at 9:00 A.M. with a fine breakfast provided by LBNL. Mr. Keller began the Agenda with a welcome to all the attendees and introductions given by all, particularly by Ms Russo and Mr. Brannan, the two newest members of the Team.

II., III., IV, V. Following a brief review of building logistics and the schedule for the Meeting, given by Mr. Bautista, Mr. Keller continued with the Agenda Items concerning an overview and history of Support Cost by Functional Activity Reporting (SCFAR) and the purpose and use made of the activity. These two items were inserted in the agenda principally for the benefit of the two new members on the Team.

VI. Mr. Keller covered Agenda Item VI that concerned the increased support FMSIC and DOE are giving the Peer review Team. His presentation was illustrated by written comments in both the latest SCFAR call letter and the DOE-issued FY2002 Functional Support Cost Report of 30 Major DOE Contractor Sites (the “big book”). This led to some discussion and input from the group. Mr. Landon stressed FMSIC must continue to support the Team, especially when a reviewed site does not meet the accuracy level of 90% or a given site refuses to let the Team come do a Review. Mr. Bautista asked if DOE could fund the Team, similar to the way FMSIC is funded from member contributions. Further, it was suggested that Mr. Morishita, as FMSIC Clearinghouse Program Manager be contacted to continue to publish Peer Review Team information on the FMSIC web site and to query FMSIC about the possibility of that organization funding the Team’s activities. These comments will be investigated further with FMSIC.

VII. Agenda Item VII concerned the Team Charter and the expectations of all Team members. This item was particularly relevant to the new members. It was mentioned that before the next Kickoff Meeting (late 2004 or early 2005) Team members must ask their managers for their support for making three trips during the succeeding year. This is in addition to the Annual Kickoff Meeting trip, which is held at a Team member’s home site. In addition, it was postulated that each site that had a representative on FMSIC should also have a member on the Peer Review Team. This will be investigated of FMSIC through Mr. Morishita. Finally, Mr. Landon felt that the Team could be larger and encouraged it grow to ten members, up from eight.

VIII., IX. Mr. Keller covered Agenda items VIII and IX together, because they were closely related. The standard documentation used for any Peer Review was examined and the basic process in conducting a Peer Review was explained, primarily for the benefit of the two new Team members. This brought up several changes for the documentation. It was requested that a statement be added to the initial formal Call Letter inviting the site’s DOE counterpart to the initial and closeout meetings. This had always been understood, but it will now be in writing. A standardized statement in the final report is to be created, concerning the site’s achieving/not achieving the required level of accuracy. FMSIC will be contacted for guidance in categorizing indirect funded GPP (IGPP) and indirect funded Capital Equipment (IGPE). This appears on the Checklist used at every review.

At this point in the meeting, adjournment was in order and the Team retired to an excellent lunch provided by LBNL. The Team was joined by a number of laboratory staff for lunch. The Team entertained questions from the LBNL staff during the lunch and readily answered any questions about Peer Reviews and the Team’s activities.

X. The Team continued the afternoon session of the Meeting with Item X of the Agenda. There were no specific difficulties with the Peer Reviews conducted in 2003.

XI. Ms. Doyle introduced Item XI, Treatment of Organizational Burden in Support Cost by Functional Activity Reporting and much discussion ensued from the Team. It was decided that this issue should be presented to FMSIC and guidance from that group sought. In addition, one of the LBNL staff at the lunch expressed an interest in this issue and in ways of structuring overheads (burden) to increase their simplicity (specifically from a researcher's perspective). It was agreed that time would be afforded her on the final day of the Kickoff Meeting for discussion in depth.

XII. Mr. Keller introduced Item XII, concerning the proper treating of "pass-through" costs within Support Cost by Functional Activity Reporting. This issue had been presented to FMSIC late in FY2003 as a result of the Peer Reviews of the three Oak Ridge contractors. The end result was that FMSIC made the decision that such costs were to be reported by the site that ultimately benefits from the expenses, not the site that initially pays the bills. Further, such pass-through costs were not to be considered as Work for Others. Team directions were for FMSIC to be queried as to the degree of this decision being passed on to DOE.

XIII, XIV. Items XIII and XIV were introduced by Mr. Bautista. He felt it would be of advantage to the Team to maintain a listing of contact staff at the sites we were to review in any given year. Further, each Team should carry a listing of all the Peer Review Team Members that could be given to sites being reviewed for them to seek further information after the Review. Such lists had to be kept well maintained and distributed to the Team.

At this point, the Team adjourned the Meeting until the next morning.

XV. Mr. Bautista had included Item XV. in the Agenda. He wanted examination/establishment of a set of criteria to be used in the scheduling of Peer Reviews each year. The initial/modified Schedule of Peer Reviews for 2004 had been brought to the Meeting with both geographical and type of site considerations. Discussion among the team revealed a number of ideas. Mr. Bautista desired to review SC sites, as he is from a similar site and would speak the same language. Mr. Hudson would prefer to review a DP or NNSA site. Ms. Russo wanted to review at least one SC site, as she is from a similar one. Mr. Landon, on the other hand, would like to review every type of laboratory, in order to learn from them. He also stated that any site that does not meet the accuracy level of 90% in a review should be re-examined by the same Team that did the initial Review. Ms. Doyle pointed out that regardless of this criteria, the situation might come up in any given year when we could not stick to the criteria. The mix of sites needing to be reviewed, the makeup of the Team, Team members unable to meet their scheduled Reviews might require deviating from the strict criteria. Ms. Doyle also found value in Team members traveling to sites closer to their home site. Mr. Keller echoed her comment, in the interest of saving travel money.

XVI.,XVII, XVIII. Items XVI, XVII, and XVIII. were discussed as one, in that they were related. Item XVI, the schedule of Peer reviews for 2003 was updated in consideration of the possibility of holding the Annual Peer Review Kickoff Meeting at Brookhaven National Laboratory (Item XVIII). Brookhaven, New York was to have been reviewed in 2004, but, if the Kickoff Meeting were to be held there for 2005, then move the Review from 2004 to 2005 and accomplish two tasks in one trip. Move the 2004 Review of Knolls Atomic Power Laboratory, New York out to 2005 (Item XVII.) and that Review can also take place immediately following the Annual Kickoff Meeting at Brookhaven. After much discussion, the schedule for 2004 had been set, with some input into 2005, as well. The complete 2005 schedule can also be established, now. The Team also indicated that the 2004 Schedule and the preliminary 2005 Schedule should be placed on the FMSIC web site. Mr. Morishita will be contacted regarding this.

XIX. Finally, under Item XIX, Other Business, Mr. Keller asked about the calculation of the level of accuracy of a Peer Review.

The Agenda items being covered, the Kickoff Meeting was concluded approximately lunchtime.

Time was afforded, however, to Ms. Carla Garbis, Business Manager for Business Services Division, LBNL who wanted further information regarding ways of structuring overheads (burden) to increase their simplicity at other laboratories. The Team participated in this discussion.

